

R E M A R K S

In the second, Non-Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Inaba (JP 08-028287A). The Examiner objected to claim 28 for an informality and objected to claims 6 and 9-11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but containing allowable subject matter. The Examiner allowed claims 7-8, 12-28, and 25.

Reconsideration and re-examination of the application as amended considering the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 as being anticipated by Inaba (JP 08-028287A). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the Examiner's rejection for the reasons below. However, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more particularly point out the invention by incorporating the subject matter of Claim 9 that the Examiner indicated was allowable. Applicants reserve the right to reinstate Claim 9 and Claim 1 in its original form if the Examiner cites new art and/or reconsiders the allowability of the subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as claimed in Claims 1-3 as filed and now as amended is not anticipated by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner. As best understood, Inaba discloses a system that uses a primary supercharger 2 that is selectively connected to one or both of the secondary superchargers 3, 4 by control of valves 7, 9, 10, 15. In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, the configuration disclosed by Inaba does not allow the primary supercharger 2 to operate in parallel with either of the secondary turbochargers 3, 4; nor does it allow the secondary turbochargers to operate in series with each other. As such, the configuration disclosed by Inaba does not anticipate Applicants' invention as claimed in Claims 1-3, which requires operation of the turbochargers in both sequential and parallel modes. While it is difficult to ascertain precisely without a complete translation of the reference, it appears that the smaller secondary turbocharger 4 is idled until needed at high engine rpm. As such, the system disclosed by Inaba would have the same disadvantages as the previously applied reference to Ganz et al. (DE 88 17 246 A1) and described in the Background of Applicants' disclosure.

Summary

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections to advance prosecution of this application. Applicants respectfully submit that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

No additional fee is believed to be due as a result of filing this paper. However, please charge any fee or apply any credit to Deposit Account 06-1510 (Ford Global Technologies, LLC). If there are insufficient funds in this account, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No.06-1505.

Respectfully submitted:



David S. Bir
Reg. No. 38,383
Attorney of Record

March 1, 2006

Bir Law, PLC
45094 Middlebury Ct.
Canton, MI 48188

Telephone: 734-981-5646
Customer No. 46,585

- 8 -
(10/710,678.)